

## REMARKS

In response to the above identified Office Action, Applicant's have amended their application and respectfully request reconsideration thereof.

### *Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15 16, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178307A1 (hereinafter Pua).

Applicant's respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15 16, 19 and 21 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for the reason that Pua does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 1 requires a "memory card interface apparatus comprising a plurality of memory card interfaces ... the plurality of memory card interfaces accessible in parallel." (*emphasis added*). In contrast, Pua does not teach or suggest that the multiple card adapter 10 can provide parallel access to the interfaces 30. Rather, Pua merely teaches a multiple memory card adapter that provides an interface for various types of memory cards. Nowhere does Pua teach or suggest that these interfaces are accessible in parallel.

In summary, Pua does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 1, as required to support a rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Furthermore, independent claims 10 and 19 each include a limitation corresponding substantially to the above-discussed limitation of claim 1. The above remarks are accordingly

also applicable to a consideration of these independent claims. Accordingly, Pua also does not anticipate claims 10 and 19.

As dependent claims are deemed to include all limitation of claims from which they depend, the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15 16, and 21 is also addressed by the above remarks, and the amendments contained herein.

### ***Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0178307A1 (hereinafter Pua) in view of the admitted prior art.

Furthermore, claims 8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0178307A1 (hereinafter Pua) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,010,066 (hereinafter Itou).

Furthermore, claims 2, 11 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0178307A1 (hereinafter Pua) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0095386A1 (hereinafter Le et al.).

Furthermore, claims 9 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0178307A1 (hereinafter Pua) as modified by Itou et al further view of Le et al.

Claims 2, 5, 9,11,14, 18 and 20 are all dependent claims incorporating the limitations of allowable independent claims 1, 10 or 19. Therefore, these claims are also allowable.

In summary, the Applicants believe that all rejections presented in the Office Action have been fully addressed and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicants


furthermore believe that all claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Adam Furst at (408) 947-8200.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 11/25/03, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Adam Furst  
Reg. No. 51,710

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 947-8200